

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CARLOS A. RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASEY L. KOZOLL,

Defendant.

No. 2:20-CV-0448-DMC-P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the Court are: (1) plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 6); and (2) plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 11). The Court denies both motions.

First, plaintiff's motion for an extension of time is unnecessary¹. The Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). On March 19, 2020, plaintiff submitted a first amended complaint, ECF No. 7. Screening of the amended complaint is currently pending. Upon screening, the Court shall either: (1) direct plaintiff to submit a

¹ Plaintiff's motion also includes a request for new case documents. The Clerk of the Court responded to this request, stating "Your requested forms are enclosed." ECF No. 6. Plaintiff then submitted his first amended complaint. See ECF No. 7.

1 subsequent amended complaint; (2) deem plaintiff's complaint adequate and direct service of
2 process; or (3) dismiss the complaint. Therefore, plaintiff's motion for an extension of time is
3 premature and is thus denied.

4 Second, plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 11, is denied as
5 duplicative and unnecessary. On April 28, 2020, the Court granted plaintiff's previous motion to
6 proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). See ECF No. 10. Thus, plaintiff already holds IFP status.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8
9 Dated: June 18, 2020


10 DENNIS M. COTA
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28